

REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-17 are pending. In the office action, claims 1-8, 10 and 12-17 are rejected, and claims 9 and 11 are allowed.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation that a quantization module is used to quantize the audio data in the second signals according to the masking threshold for providing further second signals such that the inter-channel signal redundancy is reduced in the further second signals. The support for the amendment can be found on p.6, last paragraph, of the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

At section 2, claims 1-3, 5-8 and 12-13, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miyamori et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,720, hereafter referred to as *Miyamori*) in view of *Yang et al.* (“An interchannel redundancy removal approach for high quality multi-channel audio compression”, presented at the 109th convention 2000 September 22-25, Los Angeles, CA, hereafter referred to as *Yang*).

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner states that *Miyamori* discloses a multi-channel audio coding method wherein MDCT is used to reduce intra-channel redundancy, and *Yang* discloses a method for reducing inter-channel redundancy.

It is respectfully submitted that while *Miyamori* discloses an intra-channel redundancy method and *Yang* discloses an inter-channel redundancy method, neither *Miyamori* nor *Yang* discloses or even suggests using a quantization module in cooperation with a masking threshold for converting the MDCT coefficients into integers. The Examiner further cites *Chen et al.* (“Video compression using integer DCT”, Image Processing 2000, IEEE, p.844-845, hereafter referred to as *Chen*) for disclosing the implementation of Integer DCT. However, although *Chen* discloses the use of DCT based on Walsh-Hadamard Transform, which requires integer arithmetic of adds and shifts, *Chen* only discloses an integer operation for low-power consumption. *Chen* has nothing to do with inter-channel redundancy removal.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10, as amended, are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Miyamori*, *Yang* and *Chen* references. As for claims 2-8 and 12-17, they are dependent from claims 1 and 10 and recite features not recited in claims 1

and 10. For reasons regarding claims 1 and 10 above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8 and 12-17 are also distinguishable over the cited *Miyamori*, *Yang* and *Chen* references.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8, 10 and 12-17, as amended, are allowable over the cite references. Early allowance of claims 1-8, 10 and 12-17 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955